I

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

STARRED QUESTIONS

Police

Strength of Police Officers and constables in the province.

* 389 Q.—Mr. K. V. R. Swami: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(a) the number of police officers and constables—the total police strength—in towns and cities in the Province;
(b) the police strength in each city or town;
(c) the total cost of police in cities and towns; and
(d) the cost of police in each town or city?

A.—(a) to (d) Details of police strength in Madras City and in each district are given in statement D appended to the Police Administration Report to which the hon. Member is referred. The total cost of the police force throughout the Presidency for the year 1928–29 excluding the final accounts for March 1929 was Rs. 1,58,19,404 and of the Madras City Police Rs. 13,34,323.

The Government have no information of the strength and cost in particular cities and towns.

Mr. D. Narayana Raju:—"Out of the total cost of Rs. 13,34,323 of the Madras City Police, may I know whether any part is borne by the Corporation of Madras, and if so, how much?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir Muhammad Usman Sahib Bahadur:—"As far as I know, I do not think the Corporation of Madras bears any portion of this cost."

Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti:—"May I know if there is any reason why the Corporation of Madras should bear any part of the cost of the Madras City Police?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir Muhammad Usman Sahib Bahadur:—"I do not think there is any reason why the Madras Corporation should bear any portion of this cost."

Mr. D. Narayana Raju:—"May I know if there is any Corporation which bears a part of the cost of the City Police?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir Muhammad Usman Sahib Bahadur:—"I do not think Corporations bear any portion of the cost of police as far as I know."

Mr. P. C. Venkatapathi Raju:—"Does not the Police come under the head or description of 'law and order'?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir Muhammad Usman Sahib Bahadur:—"Yes, Sir."

Mr. P. C. Venkatapathi Raju:—"Can you leave that function to the Corporation of Madras, as matters stand at present?"

14th August 1929]

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MUHAMMAD USMAN SAHIB Bahadur:—"No, we cannot."

Rao Bahadur C. S. RATNASABAPATHI MUDALIYAR:—"In view of the heavy bus traffic which runs in important cities, may I know if the hon. Member will be pleased to set apart certain percentage of the police force to be exclusively in charge of traffic control?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MUHAMMAD USMAN SAHIB Bahadur:—"I should like to have notice of the question."

Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI:—"Is it not a fact that a Traffic department is constituted so far as the Madras City Police is concerned, and that they are in charge of buses and other traffic control?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MUHAMMAD USMAN SAHIB Bahadur:—"Yes, Sir."

Mr. G. HARISARVOTTAMA RAO:—"May I know from the hon. the Home Member if it is not a fact that there is a section of the Police even in the mufassal who are deputed to this business?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MUHAMMAD USMAN SAHIB Bahadur:—"Notice."

Electricity

Applications for grant of licences for electric supply to towns.

*390 Q.—Dr. B. S. MALLAYYA: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(a) how many applications for the grant of licences for the supply of electrical energy to towns were received from private firms—

(i) prior to 1st January 1929;
(ii) between 1st January 1929 and 1st July 1929.

(b) what the names of the applicants are and the towns for which such applications were received;

(c) whether the Electrical Inspector to Government had any correspondence with any of these private firms and in particular with Messrs. Octavius Steel & Co. of Calcutta, inviting them to put in such applications;

(d) whether it is a fact that Messrs. Crompton Parkinson, Limited, went in for working out the Salem Scheme and were asked by the Electrical Inspector to refrain from doing so on the ground that he was in communication with Messrs. Octavius Steel & Co. of Calcutta for that town scheme and advised them to take up Vizagapatam with his promise of support;

(e) why, and since when have the Government deviated from their policy as laid down in G.O. Mis. No. 45, L. & M., dated 5th January 1926, G.O. Mis. No. 1342 W., dated 25th September 1926, G.O. No. 1619 W., dated 30th June 1928, and have of their own accord invited private firms to come forward; and

(f) whether it is a fact that the Electrical Inspector was not able to force his nominees as contractors on local bodies that took up electric schemes?